

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

MARK C. SAVIGNAC and
JULIA SHEKETOFF,

Plaintiffs,

v.

JONES DAY, STEPHEN J. BROGAN, and
BETH HEIFETZ

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 19-2443 (RDM)

**DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR
EXTENSION OF TIME TO RESPOND
TO COMPLAINT**

**DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME
TO RESPOND TO COMPLAINT**

For the reasons set forth below, Defendants respectfully request a 30-day extension of time, until October 4, 2019, to respond to Plaintiffs' Complaint.

1. Plaintiffs filed their Complaint on August 13, 2019. (Dkt. 1.) They did not seek a waiver of service, but instead served the Complaint on all three Defendants the next day (August 14, 2019). (Dkts. 6-8.) As a result, Defendants' response to Plaintiffs' Complaint is currently due by September 4, 2019. *See Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(a)(1)(A)(i).*

2. Defendants require an extension of time in order to respond to the Complaint. The Complaint asserts eleven separate counts arising under 3 federal statutes and 2 D.C. statutes. It alleges the facial invalidity of Jones Day's parental leave policy; complains that one Plaintiff's compensation was affected by a discriminatory review in 2017; asserts that the other Plaintiff was the victim of unlawful retaliation; and seeks to impose liability against not only the Firm, but also two individual partners. At least some of Plaintiffs' claims appear potentially susceptible to a Rule 12 motion to dismiss, and some of their factual allegations require internal investigation. Whether Defendants choose to respond by motion or by answer, additional time is needed.

3. One of the undersigned counsel is currently traveling abroad, and the other will be outside of the continental United States from August 22 until the month's end on a long-planned family trip celebrating her twin sons' 13th birthdays. Both counsel also have a host of other professional obligations with deadlines throughout August and September. Between their previously scheduled, late-August travel, the Labor Day weekend that follows, and their other professional obligations, counsel cannot adequately respond by September 4.

4. To be clear, Defendants are eager for this case to proceed expeditiously, and intend to govern themselves accordingly. However, for the reasons above, they need an additional 30 days to respond to the Complaint (either by motion or by answer). Defendants note that 30 days is half of what Defendants would have received had they been given the opportunity to waive service of the Complaint (which they would have done, had Plaintiffs asked them to do so).

5. On August 18, 2019, Defendants' counsel emailed Plaintiff Sheketoff to inquire if Plaintiffs would consent to this extension. Ms. Sheketoff responded this morning that Plaintiffs would oppose this motion. She did not identify any prejudice that would flow from the extension, however, and Defendants are not aware of any.

August 19, 2019

/s/ Mary Ellen Powers

Mary Ellen Powers
JONES DAY
51 Louisiana Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20001
Phone: (202) 879-3939

Traci Lovitt (*pro hac vice pending*)
JONES DAY
250 Vesey Street
New York, NY 10281
Phone: (212) 326-3939

Attorneys for Defendants